arXiv:1211.3626v1 [math.PR] 15 Nov 2012

The radial part of Brownian motion with respect to $\mathcal{L}$-distance under Ricci flow

Li-Juan Cheng [*]
(School of Mathematical Sciences, Beijing Normal University,
Laboratory of Mathematics and Complex Systems, Ministry of Education,
Beijing 100875, The People's Republic of China)
E-mail: chenglj@mail.bnu.edu.cn(L.J. Cheng)

Abstract

The Itô formula is established for the $\mathcal{L}$-distance between a fixed reference point ($\mathcal{L}$-base) and a g_t-Brownian motion starting from $\mathcal{L}$-base on a manifold whose Riemannian metric evolves under backwards Ricci flow, since the $\mathcal{L}$-distance fails to be differentiable on the $\mathcal{L}$ cut-locus. Furthermore, as an application, we construct a coupling by parallel transform which yields to give a new proof of some results of Topping.

Keywords: **Ricci flow, $\mathcal{L}$-functional, $\mathcal{L}$-cut-locus, g_t-Brownian motion, coupling**
MSC(2010): 60J65, 53C44, 58J65

1 Introduction and Main Result

Let M be a d-dimensional differentiable manifold which carries a smooth family of Riemannian metrics $\{g_t\}$ evolving under Ricci flow, i.e. it satisfies the nonlinear PDE

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial t} = -2\mathrm{Ric}_t, \tag{1.1}$$

introduced by Hamilton [7], where Ric_t is the Ricci curvature induced by g_t.

In light of the work of Perelman, it is convenient to consider the Ricci flow backwards in time. Note that the theory presented here is meant to be applied to solutions of the Ricci flow. Indeed, a solution of the Ricci flow can be converted into a solution of the backward Ricci flow by a time reversal. Consider the backward Ricci flow

$$\frac{\partial g}{\partial \tau} = 2\mathrm{Ric}_\tau$$

defined on a time interval $[0, T)$ including $[\tau_1, \tau_2]$ where $0 \leq \tau_2 < \tau_2$. Perelman's $\mathcal{L}$-length of a path $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{L}(\gamma) := \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\tau} \left[|\dot{\gamma}(\tau)|_\tau^2 + R(\gamma(\tau), \tau)\right] \mathrm{d}\tau \tag{1.2}$$

where $R(x, \tau)$ is the scalar curvature at x in (M, g_τ). One can use such a length to give rise to a distance, mirroring the classical construction of Riemannian geometry: we define the $\mathcal{L}$-distance between a point (x, τ_1) and (y, τ_2) as

$$Q(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) := \inf\left\{\mathcal{L}(\gamma) | \gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to \mathrm{M} \text{ is smooth and } \gamma(\tau_1) = x, \gamma(\tau_2) = y\right\}.$$

---

[*] Correspondence should be addressed to Li-Juan Cheng (E-mail: chenglj@mail.bnu.edu.cn)

Note that $\mathcal{L}$-distance can be negative, and one is not directly generating a metric space via this construction. And one recovers the classical Riemannian distance in the sense that

$$\lim_{\tau_2 \downarrow \tau_1} 2(\sqrt{\tau_2} - \sqrt{\tau_1}) Q(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) = \rho_{\tau_1}^2(x, y), \tag{1.3}$$

where ρ_τ is the Riemmanian distance with respect to g_τ.

In this paper, we want to use the comparison theorem to analyze the behavior of Brownian motion on time-inhomogeneous manifold, named g_t-Brownian motion. A g_t-Brownian motion X starting at a point $x \in M$ at time $s_0 > 0$ can be constructed in the following way. Let $\mathcal{F}(M)$ be the frame bundle, $\mathcal{O}_t(M)$ be the orthonormal frame bundle with respect to g_t. Let $\mathbf{p} : \mathcal{F}(M) \to M$ be the canonical projection. Set $(e_i)_{i=1}^d$ be the standard basis of $\mathbb{R}^d$. For each $t \in [0, T)$, let $(H_i(t))_{i=1}^d$ be the associated ∇^t-horizontal vector fields on $\mathcal{F}(M)$, i.e. $H_i(t, u)$ is the ∇^t-horizontal lift of ue_i, where ∇^t is Levi-Civita conneciton associated with g_t. Denote the canonical vertical vector fields by $(V_{\alpha,\beta})_{\alpha,\beta=1}^d$. Let $(B_t)_{t \geq 0}$ be a standard $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued Brownian motion. In this situation, Arnaudon, Coulibaly and Thalmaier [1] defined the horizontal Brownian motion on $\mathcal{F}(M)$ as the solution of the following Stratonovich SDE:

$$\begin{cases} \mathrm{d}u_t = \sqrt{2} \sum_{i=1}^d H_i(t, u_t) \circ \mathrm{d}B_t^i - \dfrac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha,\beta=1}^d \mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(t, u_t) V_{\alpha\beta}(u_t) \mathrm{d}t, \\ u_{s_0} \in \mathcal{O}_{s_0}(M), \end{cases}$$

where $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(t, u_t) = \partial_t g_t(u_t e_\alpha, u_t e_\beta), \quad \alpha, \beta = 1, 2, \cdots, d$. They show that the last term promises $u_t \in \mathcal{O}_t(M)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$. g_t-Brownian motion on M is then defined as $X_t = \mathbf{p}u_t$, and $X_{s_0} = x$. For the given reference point ($\mathcal{L}$-base) $(o, 0)$ in $M \times [0, T)$, define the radius function

$$Q(x, t) := Q(x, t; o, 0), \quad \text{for} \quad x \in M$$

as the $\mathcal{L}$-distance in M of (x, t) from $(o, 0)$. If Q is smooth, then by the Itô formula,

$$Q(X_t, t) = Q(x, s_0) + \sqrt{2} \int_{s_0}^t \left\langle \nabla_1^t Q(X_s, s), u_s \mathrm{d}B_s \right\rangle_s + \int_{s_0}^t \left[\Delta_s Q(X_s, s) + \partial_s Q(X_s, s) \right] \mathrm{d}s,$$

where Δ_s is Laplace-Beltrami operator associated with g_s. However, the method suffers one irritating difficulty. For many manifold, Q is not smooth on whole manifold. In general, it is not clear even whether $Q(X_t, t)$ is a semimartingale. Actually, this is the case and will be proved in the first course of this paper.

We would like to indicate that when g_t is independent of t, the semimartingale property for the radial part of Brownian motion w.r.t. Riemannian distance was first considered by Kendall [9]. This is a basic work on stochastic differential geometry analysis and further applied to e.g. giving conditions for diffusion process to be non-explosive or to be transient (see e.g.[12]). Especially, it was further applied to the construction of coupling processes on manifold (see [18, Chapter 2]).

For the time-inhomogeneous case, Kuwada [10] shows that the radial part of Brownian motion $\rho_t(o, X_t)$, i.e. the distance from o to X_t w.r.t. g_t, is a semimartingale. After that, the coupling of Brownian motions with respect to $\mathcal{L}$-distance was established via approximation by geodesic random walk (cf. [10]). Here, we want to give a direct construction of a coupling $(X_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}, \tilde{X}_{\bar{\tau}_2 t})$ of $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$- and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motions based on the method applied in [18, Chapter 2], and obtain some detailed behavior of $Q(X_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \tilde{X}_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}, \bar{\tau}_2 t)$. For more history concerning related work, we refer the reader to [11] as well.

It is sufficient to consider the case of compact M, in which case the diffusion X_t does not explode to infinity and all the curvature of M are bounded above and below, since X_t is non-explosive before the life time of the metric family (cf. [10]) and a localization argument leads to the noncompact case. Now we present the main result as follows.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists a non-decreasing continuous process L which increases only when $(X_t, t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o, 0))$ such that*

$$\mathrm{d}Q(X_t, t) = \sqrt{2} \left\langle \nabla_1^t Q(X_t, t), \mathrm{d}B_t \right\rangle_t + \left[\Delta_t Q + \partial_t Q\right](X_t, t)\mathrm{d}t - \mathrm{d}L_t, \ 0 < s_0 \le t < T, \qquad (1.4)$$

where $\nabla_1^t Q(\cdot, t)$ and $\Delta_t Q(\cdot, t)$ are defined to be zero where $Q(\cdot, t)$ fails to be differentiable. In particular, $Q(X_t, t)$ is semimartingale.

The rest paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we introduce $\mathcal{L}$-cut-locus, and give some useful properties about it. In Section 3, we aim to prove Theorem 1.1. In the final section, we construct a coupling of $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$- and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motions by parallel displacement and further reprove the normalized $\mathcal{L}$-transportation cost inequality, which was first introduced by Topping [17].

Thought out this paper, we keep the notations as in [17].

2 Definition and properties of the $\mathcal{L}$-cut-locus

In this section, we first want to present some useful conclusions about the properties of the $\mathcal{L}$ cut-locus. Throughout this appendix, we will considering a smooth backwards Ricci flow g_τ on a closed manifold M defined on an interval $[0, T)$, and we use the notation

$$\Upsilon := \{(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) \mid x, y \in M \text{ and } 0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 < T\}.$$

Similar as Riemannian distance, Q will fail to be smooth on some subset $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ which will be defined as follows. Given $\tau_1, \tau_2 \in [0, T)$ with $\tau_1 < \tau_2$ and $x \in M$, we define $\mathcal{L}$-exponential map $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1,\tau_2} \exp_x : T_x M \to M$ by $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1,\tau_2} \exp_x(Z) = \gamma(\tau_2)$, where γ is a unique $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic (cf. Remark 4.2) from x at time τ_1 with the initial condition $\lim_{\tau \downarrow \tau_1} \sqrt{\tau}\dot{\gamma}(\tau) = Z$. Note that the $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic also induces a notation of $\mathcal{L}$-Jacobi field, and we refer the reader to [5, Chapter 7]. It is convenient to define

$$\Omega(x, \tau_1; \tau_2) := \left\{ Z \in T_x M \;\middle|\; \begin{array}{l} \gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M \ \text{ defined by } \gamma(\tau) = \mathcal{L}_{\tau_1,\tau} \exp_x(Z) \\ \text{is a unique minimising } \mathcal{L}\text{-geodesic} \end{array} \right\} \qquad (2.1)$$

Define $\Omega^*(x,\tau_1;T)$ to be the intersection of all the sets $\Omega(x,\tau_1;\tau_2)$, over $\tau_2\in(\tau_1,T)$. For $Z\in T_xM\setminus\Omega^*(x,\tau_1;T)$, define $\bar\tau(x,\tau_1;Z):=\sup\{\tau\in(\tau_1,T)\mid Z\in\Omega(x,\tau_1;\tau)\}$. We then define the possibly empty set

$$\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}:=\left\{(x,\tau_1;y,\tau')\;\middle|\;\begin{array}{l}x\in M,\tau_1\in[0,T);\\ y=\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1,\tau'}\exp_x(Z)\text{ for some }Z\in T_xM/\Omega^*(x,\tau_1;T);\\ \tau'=\bar\tau(x,\tau_1;Z)\in[\tau_1,T)\end{array}\right\}.$$

Let

$$\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((x,\tau_1)):=\{(y,\tau_2)\in M\times(\tau_1,T)\mid(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}\}.$$

$\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ can be characterized as the union of two sets: the first consisting of points $(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)$ such that there exists more than one minimising $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic $\gamma:[\tau_1,\tau_2]\to M$ with $\gamma(\tau_1)=x$ and $\gamma(\tau_2)=y$, and the second consisting of points $(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)$ such that γ is conjugate to x (with respect to $\mathcal{L}$-Jacobi fields) along a minimizing $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic $\gamma:[\tau_1,\tau_2]\to M$ with $\gamma(\tau_1)=x,\gamma(\tau_2)=y$. It is easy to check that these two subsets are measure zero (cf. [19, lemma 2.14]), then we have

Lemma 2.1. *Assume that the Ricci curvature is bounded from below on* $[0,\tau]$ *for* $\tau\in[0,T)$. *Then* $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ *and* $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))$ *are closed sets of measure zero in* Υ *and* $M\times[0,T)$ *respectively. Moreover,*

$$\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}_t(o):=\{x\in M:(x,t)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))\}$$

measure zero in M.

Since X_t is generated by a non-degenerated operator, the following is a direct result of Lemma 2.1.

Lemma 2.2. $\{t\in[0,T)\mid(X_t,t)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))\}$ *has Lebesgue measure zero almost surely.*

Proof. Since by [10, Lemma 2], for $t\in(s_0,T)$ and any starting point $x\in M$, the law of X_t under $\mathbb{P}^x$ is absolutely continuous with respect to the g_t-Riemannian volume measure. Moreover $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}_t(o)$ has g_t-measure zero, we have

$$\mathbb{E}^x\left[\int_{s_0}^T 1_{\{(X_t,t)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))\}}\mathrm{d}t\right]=\int_{s_0}^T\mathbb{P}^x((t,X_t)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}(o,0))\mathrm{d}t=\int_{s_0}^T\mathbb{P}^x(X_t\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}_t(o))\mathrm{d}t=0,$$

it follows that $\int_{s_0}^T 1_{\{(X_t,t)\in\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}(o,0)\}}\mathrm{d}t=0$, a.s..

□

The following lemma presents some important properties about $\mathcal{L}$ cut-locus and Q, which can be referred from [5, Lemma 7.27] .

Lemma 2.3. ([*17, Lemma A.2*] *or* [*5, Lemma* 7.27]) *We have that:*

(1) *the set* $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ *is closed in* Υ.

(2) *the function* Q *is smooth on* $\Upsilon\backslash\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$.

(3) *the minimising $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic corresponding to each point in* $\Upsilon\backslash\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ *is smoothly dependent on that point in the sense that if we associate to each point* $(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)\in\Upsilon\backslash\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ *the vector* $Z\in\Omega(x,\tau_1;\tau_2)\in T_xM$ *for which* $\mathcal{L}_{\tau_1,\tau_2}\exp_x(Z)=y$*, then* Z *depends smoothly on* $(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)$*.*

(4) *on* $\Upsilon\backslash\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ *we have*

$$\frac{\partial Q}{\partial\tau_1}(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)=\sqrt{\tau_1}\left(|\dot\gamma(\tau_1)|^2_{\tau_1}-R(x,\tau_1)\right);\nabla_1Q(x,\tau_1;y,\tau_2)=-2\sqrt{\tau_1}\dot\gamma(\tau_1),\qquad(2.2)$$

where ∇_1Q *denotes the gradient with respect to the first variable* x*, using the metric* g_{τ_1}*;* $\gamma:[\tau_1,\tau_2]\to M$ *be the minimizing* $\mathcal{L}$*-geodesic from* x *to* y*. Analogous formulae hold for the derivative with respect to* y *and* τ_2*.*

3 Proof of Theorem 1.1

As announced, it suffices to prove Theorem 1.1 on compact M. We may assume that M is compact and $[0,T]$ is finite interval. We first state the Itô formula for smooth functions.

Lemma 3.1. *Let* f *be a smooth function on* $M\times[0,T]$*. Then,*

$$\mathrm{d}f(X_t,t)=\frac{\partial f}{\partial t}(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}t+\Delta_tf(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}t+\sqrt{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}u_te_if(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}B^i_t.\qquad(3.1)$$

We now apply the Itô formula Lemma3.1 to the process $Q(X_t,t)$ up to singularity. As long as (X_t,t) stays away from $\mathcal{L}$-cut-locus of $(o,0)$,

$$\mathrm{d}Q(X_t,t)=\mathrm{d}\beta_t+\left[\Delta_tQ+\frac{\partial Q}{\partial t}\right](X_t,t)\mathrm{d}t,\ t\in[s_0,T],\qquad(3.2)$$

where β_t is the martingale term given by

$$\mathrm{d}\beta_t:=\sqrt{2}\sum_{i=1}^{d}(u_se_i)Q(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}B^i_t.$$

As we observe from Lemma 2.3, the quadratic variation of the martingale β_t is given as follows

$$\mathrm{d}\left<\beta\right>_t=2\sum_{i=1}^{d}[(u_te_i)Q(X_t,t)]^2\mathrm{d}t=2|\nabla^t_1Q(X_t,t)|^2_t\mathrm{d}t=8t|\gamma'(t)|^2_t\mathrm{d}t,$$

where $\gamma:[0,t]\to M$ is the minimal $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic from o to X_t. Thus β_t can be represented by

$$2\sqrt{2t}|\dot\gamma(t)|_t\mathrm{d}b_t,\qquad(3.3)$$

where b_t is a standard one-dimensional Brownian motion. Remark 4.2 will explain that the coefficient $2\sqrt{2t}|\dot\gamma(t)|_t$ is not constant, which is different from fixed metric case.

We consider the space-time manifold $M\times[0,T]$ with metric

$$\vec{g}_{ij}(x,t)=g_{ij}(x,t);\ \vec{g}_{i0}(x,t)=0;\ (i,j=1,2,\cdots,d)$$
$$\vec{g}_{00}(x,t)=1.$$

and $\frac{\partial g_{ij}(x,t)}{\partial t} = 2R_{ij}(x,t)$. Given a path $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ with $[\tau_1, \tau_2] \subset [0, T]$ and $\gamma(\tau_1) = x,\ \gamma(\tau_2) = y$. The length of the graph $\tilde{\gamma} : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M \times [0, T]$ defined by $\tilde{\gamma}(\tau) := (\gamma(\tau), \tau)$ is given by

$$L_{\vec{g}}(\tilde{\gamma}) = \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \left| \frac{\mathrm{d}\tilde{\gamma}}{\mathrm{d}\tau} \right|_{\vec{g}} \mathrm{d}\tau = \int_{\tau_1}^{\tau_2} \sqrt{\left| \frac{\mathrm{d}\gamma}{\mathrm{d}\tau} \right|_{\tau}^{2} + 1}\ \mathrm{d}\tau.$$

Then the distance between (x, τ_1) and (y, τ_2) can be defined as before:

$$\mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}(x, \tau_1; y, \tau_2) := \inf_{\tilde{\gamma}} L_{\vec{g}}(\tilde{\gamma}).$$

Recall that $\mathcal{L}$Cut is a closed subset in Υ. Let us define a set A by

$$A := \left\{ (y, \tau_1; z, \tau_2) \in \Upsilon \ \middle|\ \begin{array}{l} y, z \in M, \tau_2 \in [s_0, T); \\ \tau_1 = \tau_2/2; \\ Q(y, \tau_1; z, \tau_2) + Q(y, \tau_1) = Q(z, \tau_2) \end{array} \right\}.$$

Note that A is closed and hence compact since $Q(x, \tau_1; z, \tau_2))$ is continuous as a function of (y, τ_1, z, τ_2). Note that, for $(y, \tau_1; z, \tau_2) \in A$, (y, τ_1) is on a minimal $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic joining $(o, 0)$ and (z, τ_2). In particular, symmetry of the $\mathcal{L}$-cut-locus implies that

$$A \cap \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut} = \varnothing.$$

Combining with Lemma 2.3, $\mathcal{L}$Cut is a closed subset in Υ.

$$\delta_1 := \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}} \otimes \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}(A, \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}) > 0,$$

where $\mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}} \otimes \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}$ is a metric on Υ^2.

Lemma 3.2. ([5, *Lemma* 7.45]) *Let $0 \le \tau_1 < \tau_2 < T$, and $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ be a minimal $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic from p to q. At (q, τ_2) the $\mathcal{L}$-distance satisfies*

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \tau_2} Q(p, \tau_1; q, \tau_2) + \Delta_{\tau_2} Q(p, \tau_1; \cdot, \tau_2)(q) \le \frac{d}{\sqrt{\tau_2} - \sqrt{\tau_1}} - \frac{1}{2(\tau_2 - \tau_1)} Q(p, \tau_1; q, \tau_2). \tag{3.4}$$

Recall that we assume that M has bounded curvature, so that there exists constant $C_0 < \infty$ such that

$$\max_{(x,\tau) \in M \times [s_0, T]} |\mathrm{Rm}_\tau|(x) \vee |\mathrm{Ric}_\tau|(x) \le C_0. \tag{3.5}$$

Due to (3.5), we have a comparison of Riemannian metrics at different times. That is for τ_1, τ_2,

$$e^{-2C_0(\tau_2 - \tau_1)} g_{\tau_2} \le g_{\tau_1} \le e^{2C_0(\tau_2 - \tau_1)} g_{\tau_2}. \tag{3.6}$$

We obtain the following bounds for Q from (3.5) and (3.6).

Lemma 3.3. ([5, *Lemma* 7.13]) *Let $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ be a minimal $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic. Then, for $\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$,*

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{e^{-2C_0(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}}{2\sqrt{\tau_2} - \sqrt{\tau_1}} \rho_T(\gamma(\tau_1), \gamma(\tau))^2 - \frac{2}{3} d C_0 (\tau_2^{3/2} - \tau_1^{3/2}) &\le Q(\gamma(\tau_1), \tau_1; \gamma(\tau_2), \tau_2) \\ &\le \frac{e^{2C_0(\tau_2 - \tau_1)}}{2\sqrt{\tau_2} - \sqrt{\tau_1}} \rho_T(\gamma(\tau_1), \gamma(\tau_2))^2 + \frac{2}{3} d C_0 (\tau_2^{3/2} - \tau_1^{3/2}) \end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

Combining Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3, we have for $(x,t) \notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))$,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\partial}{\partial t}Q(x,t) + \Delta_t Q(x,t) &\leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{t}} - \frac{1}{2t}Q(x,t) < \frac{d}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{1}{2t}Q(x,t)^- \\ &\leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{dC_0}{3t}t^{3/2}.\end{aligned}$$

Define $V(t) = \frac{4d}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{dC_0}{2}\sqrt{t}$. It is easy to see that

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}Q(x,t) + \Delta_t Q(x,t) \leq V(t). \tag{3.8}$$

The following lemma is the key to prove Theorem 1.1.

Lemma 3.4. *Let* $(x_0,t_0) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))$ *and* $\delta \in (0,\delta_1)$. *Let* X *be* g_t*-Brownian motion starting at* x_0 *at time* t_0. *Let* $\tilde{T} := T \wedge \inf\{t \geq t_0 | \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}((x_0,t_0),(X_t,t)) = \delta\}$. *Then*

$$\mathbb{E}[Q(X_{t\wedge\tilde{T}}, t\wedge\tilde{T}) - Q(x_0,t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{\tilde{T}\wedge t} V(s)\mathrm{d}s] \leq 0.$$

Proof. We construct a point $\tilde{o}$ as follows: we choose a minimizing $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic γ from $(o,0)$ to (x_0,t_0) and choose $(\tilde{o},\tilde{t})$ on $\tilde{\gamma}$ such that $\tilde{t} = t_0/2$.

Then by construction of A, we know that $(\tilde{o},\tilde{t};x_0,t_0) \in A$. Moreover, for all $t \in [t_0,\tilde{T}]$, we have

$$\mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}} \otimes \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}((\tilde{o},\tilde{t};x_0,t_0),(\tilde{o},\tilde{t};X_t,t)) = \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}((x_0,t_0),(X_t,t)) < \delta_1.$$

Therefore, $(X_t,t) \notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}(\tilde{o},\tilde{t})$. Let

$$Q^+(x,t) := Q(o,0;\tilde{o},\tilde{t}) + Q(\tilde{o},\tilde{t};x,t).$$

Since $\tilde{o}$ lies on a minimizing $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic from $(o,0)$ to (x_0,t_0), we have $Q^+(x_0,t_0) = Q(x_0,t_0)$. Moreover, by the triangle inequality

$$Q^+(x,t) \geq Q(x,t), \quad \text{for all } (x,t) \in M \times [0,T).$$

By Lemma 3.2 and Lemma 3.3,

$$\left(\Delta_t Q^+ + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial t}\right)(x,t) \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{t}+\sqrt{t_0/2}} + \frac{dC_0}{3(\sqrt{t}-\sqrt{t_0/2})}[t^{3/2} - (t_0/2)^{3/2}] \leq \frac{4d}{\sqrt{t}} + \frac{dC_0}{2}\sqrt{t} = V(t).$$

holds if $(x,t;\tilde{o},\tilde{t}) \notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned}&Q(X_{t\wedge\tilde{T}}, t\wedge\tilde{T}) - Q(X_{t_0},t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{t\wedge\tilde{T}} V(s)\mathrm{d}s \\ \leq &Q^+(X_{t\wedge\tilde{T}}, t\wedge\tilde{T}) - Q^+(X_{t_0},t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{t\wedge\tilde{T}} V(s)\mathrm{d}s \\ \leq &Q^+(X_{t\wedge\tilde{T}}, t\wedge\tilde{T}) - Q^+(X_{t_0},t_0) - \int_{t_0}^{t\wedge\tilde{T}} \left(\Delta_s Q^+ + \frac{\partial}{\partial s}Q^+\right)(X_s,s)\mathrm{d}s\end{aligned}$$

Since Q^+ is smooth at (X_t,t) for $t \in [t_0,\tilde{T}]$, the last term is a martingale. Hence the claim follows. □

For $\delta \in (0, \delta_1)$, we define a sequence of stopping times $(S^\delta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $(T^\delta_n)_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$

$$\begin{aligned}
&T^\delta_0 := s_0;\\
&S^\delta_n := \{t \geq T^\delta_{n-1} | (X_t, t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o, 0))\};\\
&T^\delta_n := T \wedge \inf\{t \geq S^\delta_n \mid \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}((X_t, t), (X_{S^\delta_n}, S^\delta_n)) = \delta\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Note that these are well-defined because $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ and

$$\{(x, t) \mid \mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}(x, t; y, s) = \delta,\ s_0 \leq s \leq t < T,\ y \in M\}$$

are closed.

Proposition 3.5. *The process* $Q(X_t, t) - \int_{s_0}^t V(s)\mathrm{d}s$ *is a supermartingale.*

Proof. Due to the strong Markov property of g_t-Brownian motion, it sufficient to show that for all deterministic starting point $(x_0, t_0) \in M \times [s_0, T]$, and all $t \in [s_0, T]$

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{Q(X_t, t) - Q(X_{t_0}, t_0) - \int_{t_0}^t V(s)\mathrm{d}s\right\} \leq 0.$$

To show that we first observe that thanks to Lemma 3.4 and (3.2), for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{Q(X_{t\wedge S^\delta_n}, t \wedge S^\delta_n) - Q(X_{t\wedge T^\delta_{n-1}}, t \wedge T^\delta_{n-1}) - \int_{t\wedge T^\delta_{n-1}}^{t\wedge S^\delta_n} V(s, Q(s, X_s))\mathrm{d}s \middle| \mathscr{F}_{T^\delta_{n-1}}\right\} \leq 0, \quad (3.9)$$

and

$$\mathbb{E}\left\{Q(X_{t\wedge T^\delta_n}, t \wedge T^\delta_n) - Q(X_{t\wedge S^\delta_n}, t \wedge S^\delta_n) - \int_{t\wedge S^\delta_n}^{t\wedge T^\delta_n} V(s, Q(X_s, s))\mathrm{d}s \middle| \mathscr{F}_{S^\delta_n}\right\} \leq 0.$$

It remains to show that $T_n \to T$ as $n \to \infty$. If

$$\lim_{n\to\infty} T_n =: T_\infty < T,$$

then $T^\delta_n - S^\delta_n$ converges to 0 as $n \to \infty$. In addition, $\mathbf{d}_{\vec{g}}(X_{S^\delta_n}, S^\delta_n; X_{T^\delta_n}, T^\delta_n) = \delta$ must hold for infinitely many $n \in \mathbb{N}$. It contradicts to the fact that X_t is uniformly continuous on $[0, T]$. ☐

Lemma 3.6. $\lim_{\delta\to 0} \sum_{n=1}^\infty |T^\delta_n - S^\delta_n| = 0$ *almost surely.*

Proof. For $\delta > 0$, define

$$\begin{aligned}
&E_\delta = \{t \in [s_0, T] |\ \text{there exist } t' \in [s_0, T] \text{ satisfying } |t - t'| \leq \delta \ \text{ and } (X_{t'}, t') \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o, 0))\},\\
&E = \{t \in [s_0, T] | (X_t, t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o, 0))\}.
\end{aligned}$$

Since the map $t \to (X_t, t)$ is continuous and $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$ is closed, E is closed and hence $E = \bigcap_{\delta>0} E_\delta$ holds. By the definition of S^δ_n and T^δ_n

$$E \subset \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty [S^\delta_n, T^\delta_n] \subset E_\delta.$$

and hence the monotone convergence theorem implies

$$\lim_{\delta\to 0} \sum_{n=1}^\infty |T^\delta_n - S^\delta_n| \leq \lim_{\delta\to 0} \int_{s_0}^T 1_{E_\delta}(t)\mathrm{d}t = \int_{s_0}^T 1_E(t)\mathrm{d}t = 0.$$

almost surely, where the last equality follows from Lemma 2.1.

☐

Lemma 3.7. *The martingale part of* $Q(X_t, t)$ *is*

$$\left\langle \nabla_1^t Q(X_t,t), u_t \mathrm{d}B_t \right\rangle_t = \sum_{i=1}^d u_t e_i Q(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}B_t^i.$$

Proof. By the martingale representation theorem, there exists an $\mathbb{R}^d$-valued process η such that the martingale part of $Q(X_t,t)$ equals to $\int_0^t \eta_s \mathrm{d}B_s$. Let

$$N_t := \int_{s_0}^t \eta_s \mathrm{d}B_s - \sum_{i=1}^d (u_t e_i) Q(X_t,t)\mathrm{d}B_t^i.$$

Using the stopping times S_n^δ and T_n^δ, the quadratic variation $\langle N\rangle_T$ of N is expressed as follows:

$$\langle N\rangle_T = \sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{n=1}^\infty \left(\int_{T_{n-1}^\delta \wedge T}^{S_n^\delta \wedge T} |\eta_t^i - (u_t e_i)Q(X_t,t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t + \int_{S_n^\delta \wedge T}^{T_n^\delta \wedge T} |\eta_t^i - (u_t e_i)Q(X_t,t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t \right).$$

Since $(X_t,t) \notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))$ if $t \in (T_{n-1}^\delta, S_n^\delta)$, the Itô formula yields

$$\int_{T_{n-1}^\delta \wedge T}^{S_n^\delta \wedge T} |\eta_t^i - (u_t e_i)Q(X_t,t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t = 0$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $i = 1, 2, \cdots, d$. For the second term in the right hand side, since the manifold is compact, there exits a constant $C > 0$, such that

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{i=1}^d \sum_{n=1}^\infty \int_{S_n^\delta \wedge T}^{T_n^\delta \wedge T} |\eta_t^i - u_t e_i Q(X_t,t)|^2 \mathrm{d}t &\le \int_{\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty [S_n^\delta, T_n^\delta]} (|\eta_t|^2 + 4|t\dot{\gamma}(t)|^2)\mathrm{d}t \\ &\le \int_{\bigcup_{n=1}^\infty [S_n^\delta, T_n^\delta]} (|\eta_t|^2 + C)\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned}$$

Since η_t is locally square-integrable on $[s_0, T]$ almost surely. Lemma 3.6 yields $\langle N\rangle_T = 0$ and the conclusion follows. □

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We can now conclude the proof of Theorem 1.1: Set $I_\delta := \bigcup_{n=1}^\infty [S_n^\delta, T_n^\delta]$. Let

$$\begin{aligned}L_t^\delta =& - Q(X_t,t) + Q(X_{s_0}, s_0) + \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (u_s e_i) Q(X_s,s)\mathrm{d}B_s^i \\ &+ \int_{[0,t]\setminus I_\delta} \left[\Delta_s Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}\right](X_s,s)\mathrm{d}s + \int_{[0,t]\cap I_\delta} V(s)\mathrm{d}s.\end{aligned}$$

By (3.2), L_t^δ is a increasing process which increases only when $t \in I_\delta$. We have

$$\begin{aligned}&Q(X_t,t) - Q(X_{s_0},s_0) - \sum_{i=1}^d \int_0^t (u_s e_i)Q(X_s,s)\mathrm{d}B_s^i - \int_{s_0}^t \left[\Delta_s Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}\right](X_s,s)\mathrm{d}s + L_t^\delta \\ =& - \int_{[0,t]\setminus I_\delta} \left[\Delta_s Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}\right](X_s,s)\mathrm{d}s - \int_{[0,t]\cap I_\delta} V(s)\mathrm{d}s. \qquad (3.10)\end{aligned}$$

From (3.8), we obtain

$$\left| \int_{[0,t]\setminus I_\delta} \left[\Delta_s Q + \frac{\partial Q}{\partial s}\right](X_s,s)\mathrm{d}s + \int_{[0,t]\cap I_\delta} V(s)\mathrm{d}s \right| \le 2\int_{[0,t]\cap I_\delta} V(s)\mathrm{d}s$$

and $V(s)$ is bounded on $[0,t] \cap I_\delta$, Lemma 3.6 yields that the right hand of (3.10) convergence to 0 as $\delta \to 0$. Thus, $L_t := \lim_{\delta \downarrow 0} L_t^\delta$ exists for all $t \in [s_0, T]$ almost surely and hence (1.4) holds. We can easily deduce the fact that L_t increases only when $(X_t, t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}((o,0))$ from the corresponding property of L_t^δ. □

4 Coupling of Brownian motion with respect to $\mathcal{L}$-distance under Ricci flow

Very recently, Kuwada and Philipowski [11] construct a coupling via approximation by geodesic. And further applied to proving the monotonicity of the normalized $\mathcal{L}$-transportation cost between solutions of the heat equation. It is well-known that coupling is a useful tool both in stochastic analysis and geometric analysis. Here, we want to give the construction of the coupling in different way, which avoid to large estimations appeared in [11]. We would like to indicate that this method is essentially due to Wang [18] for time-homogeneous case. First, we introduce the some basic notations.

Definition 4.1. (*space-time parallel vector field*). *Let $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 \le T$ and $\gamma : [\tau_1, \tau_2] \to M$ be smooth curve. We say that a vector field Z along γ is space-time parallel if*

$$\nabla^\tau_{\dot\gamma(\gamma)} Z(\tau) = -\mathrm{Ric}^\sharp_\tau(Z(\tau)) \tag{4.1}$$

holds for all $\tau \in [\tau_1, \tau_2]$. Here ∇^τ stands for the covariant derivative associated with the g_τ-Levi-Civita connection and $\mathrm{Ric}^\sharp_\tau$ is defined by regarding the g_τ-Ricci curvature as a $(1,1)$-tensor.

Since (4.1) is a linear first order ODE, for any $\xi \in T_{\gamma(\tau_1)}M$ there exists a unique space-time parallel vector field Z along γ with $Z(\tau_1) = \xi$. Note that whenever Z and Z' are space-time parallel vector fields along a curve γ, their g_τ-inner product is constant in τ:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}\tau}\left\langle Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)\right\rangle_\tau &= \frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}(Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)) + \left\langle \nabla^\tau_{\dot\gamma(\tau)} Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)\right\rangle_\tau + \left\langle Z(\tau), \nabla^\tau_{\dot\gamma(\tau)} Z'(\tau)\right\rangle_\tau \\ &= 2\mathrm{Ric}_\tau(Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)) - \mathrm{Ric}_\tau(Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)) - \mathrm{Ric}_\tau(Z(\tau), Z'(\tau)) \\ &= 0.\end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

Remark 4.2. *The minimal $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic $\gamma = \gamma^{t_1,t_2}_{x,y}$ of $Q(x, t_1; y, t_2)$ satisfies the $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic equation*

$$\nabla^t_{\dot\gamma(t)}\dot\gamma(t) = \frac{1}{2}\nabla^t R_t - 2\mathrm{Ric}^\sharp_t(\dot\gamma(t)) - \frac{1}{2t}\dot\gamma(t).$$

Therefore, $\sqrt{t}\dot\gamma(t)$ is not space-time parallel to γ in general and their g_t-inner product is not constant in t ($\sqrt{t}\dot\gamma(t)$ does not satisfy (4.1)). Therefore the coefficient in the martingale part (3.3) is not constant as time-homogeneous case.

Definition 4.3. (*space-time parallel transport*). *For $x, y \in M$ and $0 < \tau_1 < \tau_2 \le T$, we define a map $P^{\tau_1,\tau_2}_{x,y} : T_xM \to T_yM$ as follows: $P^{\tau_1,\tau_2}_{x,y}(\xi) := Z(\tau_2)$, where Z is the unique space-time parallel vector field along $\gamma^{\tau_1 \tau_2}_{x,y}$ with $Z(\tau_1) = \xi$. As explained in (4.2), $P^{\tau_1,\tau_2}_{x,y}$ is an isometry from (T_xM, g_{τ_1}) to (T_yM, g_{τ_2}). In addition, it smoothly depends on x, τ_1, y, τ_2 outside $\mathcal{L}$-cut locus.*

Since the Itô formula for $Q(X_t, t)$ is well established above, we are able to construct a parallel coupling for $g_{\bar\tau_1 t}$- and $g_{\bar\tau_2 t}$-Brownian motions.

Theorem 4.4. *Let $x \neq y$ and $0 < \bar\tau_1 < \bar\tau_2 < T$ be fixed. There exist two Brownian motions B_t and $\tilde B_t$ on a completed filtered probability space $(\Omega, \{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{1\le t\le T/\bar\tau_2}, \mathbb{P})$ such that for $t \in [s, T/\bar\tau_2]$,*

$$\mathbf{1}_{\{(X_t,\bar\tau_1 t;\tilde X_t,\bar\tau_2 t)\notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}\}}\mathrm{d}\tilde B_t = \mathbf{1}_{\{(X_t,\bar\tau_1 t;\tilde X_t,\bar\tau_2 t)\notin \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}\}}(\tilde u_t)^{-1}P^{\bar\tau_1 t,\bar\tau_2 t}_{X_t,\tilde X_t}u_t\mathrm{d}B_t$$

holds, where X_t with lift u_t and $\tilde Y_t$ with lift $\tilde u_t$ solve the equation

$$\begin{cases}\mathrm{d}X_t = \sqrt{2\bar\tau_1}u_t\circ \mathrm{d}B_t, \quad X_s = x.\\ \mathrm{d}\tilde X_t = \sqrt{2\bar\tau_2}\tilde u_t\circ\mathrm{d}\tilde B_t, \quad \tilde X_s = y\end{cases} \tag{4.3}$$

And

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{d}Q(X_t,\bar\tau_1 t;\tilde X_t,\bar\tau_2 t) \le & \sqrt{2t(\bar\tau_1|\dot\gamma_1(\bar\tau_1 t)|_{\bar\tau_1 t} - \bar\tau_2|\dot\gamma_2(\bar\tau_2 t)|_{\bar\tau_2 t})^2}\mathrm{d}b_t\\ &+\left(\frac{d}{\sqrt t}(\sqrt{\bar\tau_1}-\sqrt{\bar\tau_2}) - \frac{1}{2t}Q(\bar\tau_1 t, X_t;\bar\tau_2 t,\tilde X_t)\right)\mathrm{d}t.\end{aligned} \tag{4.4}$$

where $\gamma_1 : [s,t]\to M$ is the $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic from x to X_t, $\gamma_2 : [s,t]\to M$ is the $\mathcal{L}$-geodesic from y to $\tilde X_t$.

Proof. We denote $Q(t,x,y) := Q(x,\bar\tau_1 t; y,\bar\tau_2 t)$ for simplicity. Our proof is divided into three parts.

(**a**) First, we give the construction of the couplings. Recall that u_t, the horizontal lift of X_t, satisfies the following SDE

$$\begin{cases}\mathrm{d}u_t = \sqrt{2\bar\tau_1}\sum_{i=1}^d H_i(\bar\tau_1 t, u_t)\circ\mathrm{d}B^i_t - \frac12\bar\tau_1\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar\tau_1 t,u_t)V_{\alpha\beta}(u_t)\mathrm{d}t,\\ u_s\in\mathcal{O}_{\bar\tau_1 s}(M),\ \mathbf{p}^s u_s = x.\end{cases}$$

Now, for given $x\neq y$ with $(x,\bar\tau_1 t; y,\bar\tau_2 t)\notin\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$, let γ be the minimal geodesic from x to y. Recall that $P^{\bar\tau_1 t,\bar\tau_2 t}_{x,y}$ are the parallel operators.

To get rid of the trouble that $P^{\bar\tau_1 t,\bar\tau_2 t}_{x,y}$ does not exists on $\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}$, we modify this operator so that it vanishes in a neighborhood of this set. To this end, for any $n\ge 1$ and $\varepsilon\in(0,1)$, let $h_{n,\varepsilon}\in C^\infty(\mathbb{R}^+)$ such that

$$0\le h_{n,\varepsilon}\le(1-\varepsilon),\ h_{n,\varepsilon}|_{[0,\frac{1}{2n}]} = 0,\ h_{n,\varepsilon}|_{[\frac1n,\infty)} = 1-\varepsilon.$$

Now define

$$\overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon}(t,x,y) = h_{n,\varepsilon}(\mathbf{d}_{\vec g}\otimes\mathbf{d}_{\vec g}((x,\bar\tau_1 t;y,\bar\tau_2 t),\mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut})).$$

Recall that $\mathbf{d}_{\vec g}\otimes\mathbf{d}_{\vec g}$ is the distance on Υ^2. Let $\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t$ and $\tilde X^{n,\varepsilon}_t := \mathbf{p}\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t$ solve the SDE

$$\begin{cases}\mathrm{d}\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t = \sqrt{2\bar\tau_2}\overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon}(t,X_t,\tilde X^{n,\varepsilon}_t)\sum_{i=1}^d H_i(\bar\tau_2 t,\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t)\circ\mathrm{d}\tilde B^i_t - \frac12\bar\tau_2\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar\tau_2 t,\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t)V_{\alpha\beta}(\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t)\mathrm{d}t\\ \qquad +\sqrt{2\bar\tau_2[1-(\overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon})^2(t,X_t,\tilde X^{n,\varepsilon}_t)]}\sum_{i=1}^d H_i(\bar\tau_2 t,\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_t)\circ\mathrm{d}B'^i_t,\\ \tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_s\in\mathcal{O}_{\bar\tau_2 t}(M),\ \mathbf{p}^s\tilde u^{n,\varepsilon}_s = y,\end{cases} \tag{4.5}$$

where B'_t is a Brownian motion on $\mathbb{R}^d$ independent of B_t, and $\mathrm{d}\tilde{B}_t = (\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon})^{-1} P^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t}_{X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}} u_t \mathrm{d}B_t$. Since the coefficients involved in (4.5) are at least $C^{1,1}$, the solution $\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon}$ exists uniquely.

Let us observe that $(u_t, \tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon})$ is generated by

$$\begin{aligned} L^{n,\varepsilon}_{\mathcal{O}(M\times M)}(t)(u_t, \tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) :=& \bar{\tau}_1 \Delta_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}(M)}(u_t) + \bar{\tau}_2 \Delta_{\mathcal{O}_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}(M)}(\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) \\ &+ \overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon}(t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \left\langle P^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t}_{X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}} u_t e_i, \tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon} e_j \right\rangle_t H_{u_t e_i}(\bar{\tau}_2 t) H_{\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon} e_j}(\bar{\tau}_2 t) \\ &- \frac{1}{2}\bar{\tau}_1 \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar{\tau}_1 t, u_t) V_{\alpha\beta}(u_t)\mathrm{d}t - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\tau}_2 \sum_{\alpha,\beta} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha,\beta}(\bar{\tau}_2 t, \tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) V_{\alpha\beta}(\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon})\mathrm{d}t, \end{aligned}$$

where $\{e_i\}$ is an orthonormal basis on $\mathbb{R}^d$. Next, let

$$L^{n,\varepsilon}_{M\times M}(t)(x,y) := \bar{\tau}_1 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}(x) + \bar{\tau}_2 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}(y) + \overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon}(t,x,y) \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \langle P^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t}_{x,y} X_i, Y_j \rangle_{\bar{\tau}_2 t} X_i Y_j,$$

where $\{X_i\}$ and $\{Y_i\}$ are orthonormal bases at x and y respectively. It is easy to see that $(X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) := (\mathbf{p}u_t, \mathbf{p}\tilde{u}_t^{n,\varepsilon})$ is generated by $L^{n,\varepsilon}_{M\times M}(t)$ and hence, is a coupling of $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$- and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motions as the marginal operators of $L^{n,\varepsilon}_{M\times M}(t)$ coincide with $\bar{\tau}_1 \nabla_{\bar{\tau}_1}$ and $\bar{\tau}_2 \nabla_{\bar{\tau}_2}$ respectively.

Since in some neighborhood of $\mathcal{L}$Cut the coupling is independent and hence, behaves as a Brownian motion on $M \times M$. Thus following Theorem 1.1, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}Q(t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) =& \sqrt{2t(\bar{\tau}_1 |\gamma_1(\bar{\tau}_1 t)|_{\bar{\tau}_1 t} - \bar{\tau}_2 h_{n,\varepsilon} |\dot{\gamma}_2^{n,\varepsilon}(\bar{\tau}_2 t)|_{\bar{\tau}_2 t})^2 + (1 - h^2_{n,\varepsilon})\bar{\tau}_2^2 |\dot{\gamma}_2^{n,\varepsilon}(\bar{\tau}_2 t)|^2_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}}\, \mathrm{d}b_t^{n,\varepsilon} \\ &+ \left\{ \frac{\partial Q}{\partial t} + \mathbf{1}_{(\Upsilon \setminus \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut})}[\overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon} I + (1 - \overline{h}_{n,\varepsilon}) S] \right\} (t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon})\mathrm{d}t - \mathrm{d}l_t^{n,\varepsilon}, \end{aligned} \tag{4.6}$$

where $b_t^{n,\varepsilon}$ is an one-dimensional Brownian motion, $l_t^{n,\varepsilon}$ is an increasing process which increases only when $(X_t, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}, \bar{\tau}_2 t) \in \mathcal{L}$Cut, and

$$\begin{aligned} S(t,x,y) &:= \bar{\tau}_1 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_1 t} Q(t, \cdot, y)(x) + \bar{\tau}_2 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_2 t} Q(t, x, \cdot)(y); \\ I(t,x,y) &:= \sum_{i=1}^{d} (\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1} V_i + \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2} P^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t}_{x,y} V_i)^2 Q(t,x,y), \end{aligned}$$

for $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^d$ an $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$-orthonormal basis of $T_x M$. Then, let $\mathbb{P}^{(x,y)}_{n,\varepsilon}$ be the distribution of $(X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon})$, which is a probability measure on the path space $M_x^T \times M_y^T$, where

$$M_x^T := \{\gamma \in C([s, T/\bar{\tau}_2], M) : \gamma_s = x\}$$

is equipped with the σ-field $\mathscr{F}_x^T$ induced by all measurable cylindric functions. Note that $(M_x^T, \mathscr{F}_x^T)$ is metrizable with the distance

$$\tilde{\rho}(\xi, \eta) := \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} 2^{-n} (1 \wedge \sup_{t \in [n, (n+t) \wedge T/\bar{\tau}_2)} \mathbf{d}_{\tilde{g}}(\bar{\tau}_1 t, \xi_t; \bar{\tau}_2 t, \eta_t).$$

Furthermore, $(M_x^T, \tilde{\rho})$ is a Polish space. Then $M_x^T \times M_y^T$ is a Polish space too. It is easy to see that $\{\mathbb{P}^{x,y}_{n,\varepsilon} : n \geq 1, \varepsilon > 0\}$ is tight (c.f. [16, Lemma 4]) since they are the couplings of $\mathbb{P}^x$ and

$\mathbb{P}^y$. Therefore, for each $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a probability measure $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}_\varepsilon$ and sub sequence $\{n_k\}$ such that $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}_{n_k,\varepsilon} \to \mathbb{P}^{x,y}_\varepsilon (k \to \infty)$ weakly and hence $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}_\varepsilon$ is once again a coupling of $\mathbb{P}^x$ and $\mathbb{P}^y$. Moreover, let $\varepsilon_l \to 0$ so that $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}_{\varepsilon_l} \to \mathbb{P}^{x,y}$ weakly, then $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}$ is also a coupling of $\mathbb{P}^x$ and $\mathbb{P}^y$.

Now, let $(X_t, \tilde{X}_t)$ be the coordinate (or càdlàg) process in $(M_x^T \times M_y^T, \mathscr{F}_x^T \times \mathscr{F}_y^T)$ and let $\{\mathscr{F}_t\}_{t\geq 0}$ be the natural filtration. Similar to that explained in the proof of [3, Theorem 2], we first define

$$\tilde{L}(t)(x,y) := \bar{\tau}_1 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}(x) + \bar{\tau}_2 \Delta_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}(y) + 1_{(\Upsilon \backslash \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut})}(x, \bar{\tau}_1 t; y, \bar{\tau}_2 t) \sum_{i,j=1}^d \left\langle P_{x,y}^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t} X_i, Y_j \right\rangle_t X_i Y_j.$$

It is trivial to see that $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}$ solves the martingale problem for $\tilde{L}(t)$ up to $T/\bar{\tau}_2$,

$$f(X_t, \tilde{X}_t) - \int_0^t \tilde{L}(s) f(X_s, \tilde{X}_s) \mathrm{d}s$$

is a $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}$-martingale w.r.t $\mathscr{F}$. Then $(X_t, \tilde{X}_t)$ under $\mathbb{P}^{x,y}$ is a coupling of the $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$ and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motions starting from (x, y), i.e. the solution of (4.3).

(**b**) We first claim that

$$\{t \in [s, T/\bar{\tau}_2] \mid (X_t, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}, \bar{\tau}_2 t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}\} \text{ and } \{t \in [s, T/\bar{\tau}_2] \mid (X_t, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \tilde{X}_t^{\varepsilon}, \bar{\tau}_2 t) \in \mathcal{L}\mathrm{Cut}\} \quad (4.7)$$

have Lebesgue measure zero almost surely. This assertion can be checked similarly as Lemma 2.2 by observing that $L_M^{n,\varepsilon}(t)$ is strictly elliptic, then $\mathbb{P}^{n,\varepsilon}(A) := \mathbb{P}((X_t, \tilde{X}_t^{n,\varepsilon}) \in A)$ has a density $p_t^{n,\varepsilon}(x,y)$ with respect the product volume measure $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t} \otimes g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$. By the second variation formula for $\mathcal{L}$-functional (cf. [5, Lemma 7.37 and Lemma 7.40] for instance), we have

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Q(t,x,y) + \sum_{i=1}^d (\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1} V_i + P_{x,y}^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t} V_i)^2 Q(t,x,y) \leq \frac{d}{\sqrt{t}} (\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2}) - \frac{1}{2t} Q(t,x,y),$$

for an $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$-orthonormal basis $\{V_i\}_{i=1}^d$ at x. Here, we can mimic the proof of [4](b) to obtain that

$$\mathrm{d}Q(t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t) = \mathrm{d}M_t + J(t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t)\mathrm{d}t - \mathrm{d}L_t, \quad t \in [s, T/\bar{\tau}_2],$$

where $J \in C([0,T] \times M \times M)$ and

$$J(t,x,y) \geq \frac{d}{\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1 t} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2 t}} - \frac{1}{2(\bar{\tau}_1 t - \bar{\tau}_2 t)} Q(t,x,y),$$

M_t is a local martingale and L_t is a predictable increasing process.

(**c**) As long as $(X_t, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \tilde{X}_t, \bar{\tau}_2 t)$ stays away from $\mathcal{L}$Cut, one has

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{d}Q(t, X_t, \tilde{X}_t) =& \sqrt{2t(\bar{\tau}_1 |\dot{\gamma_1}(\bar{\tau}_1 t)|_{\bar{\tau}_1 t} - \bar{\tau}_2 |\dot{\gamma_2}(\bar{\tau}_2 t)|_{\bar{\tau}_2 t})^2}\ \mathrm{d}b_t \\ &+ \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial t} Q(t,x,y) + \sum_{i=1}^d (\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1} V_i + \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2} P_{x,y}^{\bar{\tau}_1 t, \bar{\tau}_2 t} V_i)^2 Q(t,x,y)\right] \mathrm{d}t. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, (4.4) holds and l_t is an increasing process supporting only on $\mathcal{L}$Cut.

$\square$

As an important application, we will introduce Topping's result [17], i.e. the contraction in the normalized $\mathcal{L}$-transportation cost. By taking $\bar{\tau}_1 \to \bar{\tau}_2$, it recover the monotonicity of Perelman's monotonic quantities (involving both $\mathcal{W}$-entropy and $\mathcal{L}$-length), which are central in his work on Ricci flow (see [13, 14, 15]).

Suppose that $\{P_{s,t}\}_{0<s<t<T/\bar{\tau}_2}$ and $\{T_{s,t}\}_{0<s<t<T/\bar{\tau}_2}$ be the Markov inhomogeneous semi-group of $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$-Brownian motion and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motion respectively. To the $\mathcal{L}$-distance Q, we associate the Monge-Kantorovich minimization between two probability measures on M,

$$W^{\mathcal{L}}(\mu, t_1; \nu, t_2) = \inf_{\eta \in \mathscr{C}(\mu,\nu)} \int_{M\times M} Q(x, t_1; y, t_2) \mathrm{d}\eta(x, y), \tag{4.8}$$

where $\mathscr{C}(\mu,\nu)$ is the set of all probability measures on $M \times M$ with marginal μ and ν. Then, using the coupling constructed in Theorem 4.4, we have

Theorem 4.5. *Assume that M has bounded curvature tensor, i.e.*

$$\sup_{x\in M, t\in[\bar{\tau}_1 s, T]} |\mathrm{Rm}_t|_t(x) < \infty.$$

Then the normalized $\mathcal{L}$-transportation cost

$$\Theta(t, \delta_x P_{s,t}, \delta_y T_{s,t}) := 2(\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2 t} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1 t}) W^{\mathcal{L}}(\delta_x P_{s,t}, \bar{\tau}_1 t; \delta_y T_{s,t}, \bar{\tau}_2 t) - 2d(\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2 t} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1 t})^2$$

is a non-increasing function of $t \in [s, T/\bar{\tau}_2]$, that is

$$\Theta(t, \delta_x P_{s,t}, \delta_y T_{s,t}) \le 2(\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2 s} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1 s}) Q(x, \bar{\tau}_1 s; y, \bar{\tau}_2 s) - 2d(\sqrt{\bar{\tau}_2 s} - \sqrt{\bar{\tau}_1 s})^2.$$

Proof. By (4.3), there exist two coupled $g_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$ and $g_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$-Brownian motions $(X_t)_{t\in[s,T/\bar{\tau}_1]}$ and $(\tilde{X})_{t\in[s,T/\bar{\tau}_2]}$ with initial values $X_1 = x$ and $\tilde{X}_1 = y$ such that the process $(\Theta(t, X_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}, \tilde{X}_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}))_{t\in[s,T/\bar{\tau}_2]}$ is a supermartingale. Taking the expectation of this supermartingale leads to complete the proof. Note that $P_{s,t}(\cdot, \mathrm{d}x) = u(\tau_1 t, x)\mathrm{dvol}_{\bar{\tau}_1 t}$ and $T_{s,t}(\cdot, \mathrm{d}x) = u(\tau_2 t, x)\mathrm{dvol}_{\bar{\tau}_2 t}$, and u are the solutions of the heat equation

$$\frac{\partial u}{\partial \tau} = \Delta_\tau u - R_\tau u.$$

□

From the $\mathcal{L}$-optimal transportation, one can [17] recover Perelman's monotonic quantities (involving both entropies and $\mathcal{L}$-length) which are central in his work on Ricci flow (see [13, 14, 15]).

Acknowledgements The author would thank Professor Feng-Yu Wang for valuable suggestions and this work is supported in part by 985 Project, 973 Project.

References

1. Arnaudon, M., Coulibaly, K., Thalmaier, A., Brownian motion with respect to a metric depending on time: definition, existence and applications to Ricci flow, C. R. Math. Acad. Sci. Paris 346 (2008), no. 13-14, 773–778.

2. Arnaudon, M., Coulibaly, K., Thalmaier, A., Horizontal diffusion in C^1 path space, Séminaire de Probabilits XLIII, 73–94, Lecture Notes in Math., 2006, Springer, Berlin, 2011.

3. Arnaudon, M., Thalmaier, A., Wang, F.-Y., Harnack inequality and heat kernel estimates on manifolds with curvature unbounded below, Bull. Sci. Math. 130 (2006), no. 3, 223–233.

4. Cheng, L., Diffusion process on time-inhomogeneous manifolds, preprint(2012).

5. Chow, B., Chu, S.-C., Glickenstein, D., Guenther, C., Isenberg, J., Ivey, T., Knopf, D., Lu, P., Luo, F., Ni, L., The Ricci flow: techniques and applications. Part I. Geometric aspects, Mathematical Surveys and Monographs, 135. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2007. xxiv+536 pp.

6. Elworthy, K. D., Stochastic differential equations on manifolds, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series, 70. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge-New York, 1982, xiii+326 pp.

7. Hamilton, R. S., Three-manifolds with positive Ricci curvature, J. Differential Geom. 17 (1982), no. 2, 255–306.

8. Hsu, E. P., Stochastic analysis on manifolds, Graduate Studies in Mathematics, 38. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. xiv+281 pp.

9. Kendall, W. S., The radial part of Brownian motion on a manifold: a semimartingale property, Ann. Probab. 15 (1987), no. 4, 1491–1500.

10. Kuwada, K., Philipowski, R., Non-explosion of diffusion processes on manifolds with time-dependent metric, Math. Z. 268 (2011), no. 3-4, 979–991.

11. Kuwada, K., Philipowski, R., Coupling of Brownian motions and Perelman's $\mathcal{L}$-functional, J. Funct. Anal. 260 (2011), no. 9, 2742–2766.

12. Ikeda, N., Watanabe, S., Stochastic differential equations and diffusion processes, North-Holland Mathematical Library, 24. North-Holland Publishing Co., Amsterdam-New York; Kodansha, Ltd., Tokyo, 1981. xiv+464 pp.

13. Perelman, G., The entropy formula for the Ricci flow and its geometric applications, preprint (2002), arXiv:math/0211159v1.

14. Perelman, G., Ricci flow with surgery on three-manifolds, preprint(2003), arXiv:math/0303109v1.

15. Perelman, G., Finite extinction time for the solutions to the Ricci flow on certain three-manifolds, preprint (2003), arXiv:math/0307245v1.

16. von Renesse, M., Intrinsic coupling on Riemannian manifolds and polyhedra, Electron. J. Probab. 9 (2004), no. 14, 411–435 (electronic).

17. Topping, P., $\mathcal{L}$-optimal transportation for Ricci flow. J. Reine Angew. Math. 636 (2009), 93–122.

18. Wang, F.-Y., Functional Inequalities, Markov Semigroups and Spectral Theory, Science Press, Beijing, 2005.

19. Ye, R., On the l-function and the reduced volume of Perelman, I, Trans. Amer. Math. Soc. 360 (2008), no. 1, 507–531 (electronic).